arXiv:1405.5384v3 [math.DG] 19 Jun 2014

STABILITY OF THE BLASCHKE-SANTALÓ INEQUALITY IN THE PLANE

MOHAMMAD N. IVAKI

Abstract. We give a stability version of of the Blaschke-Santaló inequality in the plane.

1. Introduction

The setting of this paper is the n-dimensional Euclidean space. A compact convex subset of $\mathbb{R}^n$ with non-empty interior is called a *convex body*. The set of convex bodies in $\mathbb{R}^n$ is denoted by $\mathcal{K}^n$. Write $\mathcal{K}^n_e$ for the set of origin-symmetric convex bodies and $\mathcal{K}^n_0$ for the set of convex bodies whose interiors contain the origin.

The support function of $K\in\mathcal{K}^n$, $h_K:\mathbb{S}^{n-1}\to\mathbb{R}$, is defined by

$$h_K(u)=\max_{x\in K}\langle x,u\rangle,$$

where $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle$ stands for the usual inner product of $\mathbb{R}^n$. The polar body, K^*, of $K\in\mathcal{K}^n_0$ is the convex body defined by

$$K^*=\{y\in\mathbb{R}^n:\langle x,y\rangle\leq 1 \text{ for all } x\in K\}.$$

For $x\in\operatorname{int}K$, let $K^x:=(K-x)^*$. The Santaló point of K, denoted by s, is the unique point in $\operatorname{int}K$ such that

$$V(K^s)\leq V(K^x)$$

for all $x\in\operatorname{int}K$. For a body $K\in\mathcal{K}^n_e$, the Santaló point is at the origin. The Blaschke-Santaló inequality [4, 21] states that

$$V(K^s)V(K)\leq\omega_n^2,$$

with equality if and only if K is an ellipsoid. Here ω_n is the volume of B, the unit ball of $\mathbb{R}^n$. The equality condition was settled by Saint Raymond [20] in the symmetric case and Petty [19] in the general case.

A natural tool in the affine geometry of convex bodies is the Banach-Mazur distance which for two convex bodies $K,\bar{K}\in\mathcal{K}^n$ is defined by

$$d_{\mathcal{BM}}(K,\bar{K})=\min\{\lambda\geq 1:(K-x)\subseteq\Phi(\bar{K}-y)\subseteq\lambda(K-x),\ \ \Phi\in GL(n),\ x,y\in\mathbb{R}^n\}.$$

It is easy to see that $d_{\mathcal{BM}}(K,\Phi\bar{K})=d_{\mathcal{BM}}(K,\bar{K})$ for all $\Phi\in GL(n)$. Moreover, the Banach-Mazur distance is multiplicative. That is, for $K_1,K_2,K_3\in\mathcal{K}^n_e$ the following inequality holds:

$$d_{\mathcal{BM}}(K_1,K_3)\leq d_{\mathcal{BM}}(K_1,K_2)d_{\mathcal{BM}}(K_2,K_3).$$

The main result of the paper is stated in the following theorem.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 52A40, 52A10; Secondary 53A15.

Key words and phrases. the Blaschke-Santaló inequality; stability of the Blaschke-Santaló inequality.

Theorem. *There exist constants $\gamma,\ \varepsilon_0 > 0$, such that the following holds: If $0 < \varepsilon < \varepsilon_0$ and K is a convex body in $\mathbb{R}^2$ such that $V(K^s)V(K) \geq \frac{\pi^2}{1+\varepsilon}$, then $d_{\mathcal{BM}}(K,B) \leq 1 + \gamma\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{4}}$. Furthermore, if K is an origin-symmetric body, then $d_{\mathcal{BM}}(K,B) \leq 1 + \gamma\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}$.*

In $\mathbb{R}^n$, $n \geq 3$, the stability of the Blaschke-Santaló inequality was first proved by K.J. Böröczky [6], and then by K. Ball and K.J. Böröczky [2] with a better order of approximation (see also [3] for the stability of functional forms of the Blaschke-Santaló inequality). In $\mathbb{R}^2$, a result has been obtained by K.J. Böröczky and E. Makai [7] where the order of approximation in the origin-symmetric case is $1/3$ and in the general case is $1/6$. Therefore, our main theorem provides a sharper stability result. Moreover, stability of the p-affine isoperimetric inequality also follows from the stability of the Blaschke-Santaló inequality (See [17, 22] for definitions of the p-affine surface areas, and for the statements of the p-affine isoperimetric inequalities, and see also [13, 14] for their generalizations in the context of the Orlicz-Brunn-Minkowski theory, basic properties, and affine isoperimetric inequalities they satisfy.). Stability of the p-affine isoperimetric inequality, in the Hausdorff distance, for bodies in $\mathcal{K}^2_e$ was established by the author in [12] via the affine normal flow with the order of approximation equal to $3/10$. Therefore, the main theorem here replaces $3/10$ by $1/2$ and extends that result, if $p > 1$, to bodies with the Santaló points or centroids at the origin, and if $p = 1$, to any convex body in $\mathcal{K}^2$. An application of such a stability result to some Monge-Ampère functionals is given by Ghilli and Salani [9].

Acknowledgment. I am indebted to Monika Ludwig and the referee for the very careful reading of the original submission.

2. Background material

A convex body is said to be of class $\mathcal{C}^k_+$, for some $k \geq 2$, if its boundary hypersurface is k-times continuously differentiable, in the sense of differential geometry, and the Gauss map $\nu : \partial K \to \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$, which takes x on the boundary of K to its unique outer unit normal vector $\nu(x)$, is well-defined and a $\mathcal{C}^{k-1}$-diffeomorphism.

Let K, L be two convex bodies and $0 < a < \infty$, then the Minkowski sum $K + aL$ is defined by $h_{K+aL} = h_K + ah_L$ and the mixed volume $V_1(K,L)$ ($V(K,L)$ for planar convex bodies) of K and L is defined by

$$V_1(K,L) = \frac{1}{n} \lim_{a\to 0^+} \frac{V(K+aL) - V(K)}{a}.$$

A fundamental fact is that corresponding to each convex body K, there is a unique Borel measure S_K on the unit sphere such that

$$V_1(K,L) = \frac{1}{n} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} h_L dS_K$$

for any convex body L. The measure S_K is called the surface area measure of K.

A convex body K is said to have a positive continuous curvature function f_K, defined on the unit sphere, provided that for each convex body L

$$V_1(K,L) = \frac{1}{n} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} h_L f_K d\sigma,$$

where σ is the spherical Lebesgue measure on $\mathbb{S}^{n-1}$. A convex body can have at most one curvature function; see [5, p. 115]. If K is of class $\mathcal{C}^2_+$, then S_K is absolutely continuous with respect to σ, and the Radon-Nikodym derivative $dS_K/d\sigma : \mathbb{S}^{n-1} \to \mathbb{R}$ is the reciprocal Gauss curvature of ∂K (viewed as a function of the outer unit normal vectors). For every $K \in \mathcal{K}^n$, $V(K) = V_1(K, K)$.

Of significant importance in convex geometry is the Minkowski mixed volume inequality. Minkowski's mixed volume inequality states that for $K, L \in \mathcal{K}^n$,

$$V_1(K, L)^n \geq V(K)^{n-1} V(L).$$

In the class of origin-symmetric convex bodies, equality holds if and only if $K = cL$ for some $c > 0$. In $\mathbb{R}^2$ a stronger version of Minkowski's inequality was obtained by Groemer [10]. We provide his result for bodies in $\mathcal{K}^2_e$:

Theorem 1. [10] *Let $K, L \in \mathcal{K}^2_e$ and set $D(K) = 2 \max_{\mathbb{S}^1} h_K$, then*

$$\frac{V(K, L)^2}{V(K)V(L)} - 1 \geq \frac{V(K)}{4D^2(K)} \max_{u \in \mathbb{S}^1} \left| \frac{h_K(u)}{V(K)^{\frac{1}{2}}} - \frac{h_L(u)}{V(L)^{\frac{1}{2}}} \right|^2. \tag{2.1}$$

The Santaló point of K is characterized by the following property

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \frac{u}{h^{n+1}_{K-s}(u)} d\sigma(u) = 0.$$

Thus for an arbitrary convex body K, the indefinite σ-integral of $h^{-(n+1)}_{K-s}$ satisfies the sufficiency condition of Minkowski's existence theorem in $\mathbb{R}^n$ (see, for example, Schneider [22, Theorem 8.2.2]). Hence, there exists a unique convex body (up to translation) with curvature function

$$f_{\Lambda K} = \frac{V(K)}{V(K^s)} h^{-(n+1)}_{K-s}. \tag{2.2}$$

Moreover, $\Lambda \Phi K = \Phi \Lambda K$ (up to translation) for $\Phi \in GL(n)$, by [16, Lemma 7.12]. Finally, we remark that by the Minkowski inequality for all $L \in \mathcal{K}^2$ there holds $V^2(L) = V(\Lambda L, L)^2 \geq V(L)V(\Lambda L)$. Therefore $V(L) \geq V(\Lambda L)$ for all $L \in \mathcal{K}^2$, with equality if and only if ΛL is a translate of L. In this paper we always assume that the centroid of ΛK is the origin of the plane.

Remark 2. If $K \in \mathcal{K}^n$ is of class $\mathcal{C}^\infty_+$, then $h_K \in \mathcal{C}^\infty$. In fact, by definition of the class $\mathcal{C}^\infty_+$, the Gauss map ν is a diffeomorphism of class $\mathcal{C}^\infty$ and so $h_K(\cdot) = \langle \nu^{-1}(\cdot), \cdot \rangle$ is of class $\mathcal{C}^\infty$. In this case, since ΛK is a solution to the Minkowski problem (2.2) with positive $\mathcal{C}^\infty$ prescribed data $\frac{V(K)}{V(K^s)} h^{-(n+1)}_{K-s}$, ΛK is of class $\mathcal{C}^\infty_+$; see Cheng and Yau [8, Theorem 1].

Theorem 3. [11] *Suppose that $K \in \mathcal{K}^2_e$ is of class $\mathcal{C}^\infty_+$. If $m \leq h_K f_K^{1/3} \leq M$ for some positive numbers m and M, then there exist two ellipses E_{in} and E_{out} such that $E_{in} \subseteq K \subseteq E_{out}$ and*

$$\left(\frac{V(E_{in})}{\pi} \right)^{2/3} = m, \quad \left(\frac{V(E_{out})}{\pi} \right)^{2/3} = M.$$

Corollary 4. *Suppose that $K \in \mathcal{K}^2_e$ is of class $\mathcal{C}^\infty_+$. If $m \leq h_K f_K^{1/3} \leq M$ for some positive numbers m and M and $V(K) = \pi$, then $m \leq 1 \leq M$. Moreover, without*

any assumption on the area of K, we have

$$d_{\mathcal{BM}}(K,B) \le \left(\frac{M}{m}\right)^{\frac{3}{2}}.$$

Proof. Let E_{in} and E_{out} be the ellipses from Theorem 3. Since $V(E_{out}) \ge \pi$ and $V(E_{in}) \le \pi$, the first claim follows (For another proof by Andrews, see [1, Lemma 10] in which he does not assume that K is origin-symmetric.). To prove the bound on the Banach-Mazur distance, we may first apply a special linear transformation $\Phi \in SL(2)$ such that ΦE_{out} is a disk. Then it is easy to see that $\Phi E_{out} \subseteq \frac{V(E_{out})}{V(E_{in})}\Phi E_{in}$. Therefore

$$\Phi E_{in} \subseteq \Phi K \subseteq \frac{V(E_{out})}{V(E_{in})}\Phi E_{in},$$

and

$$d_{\mathcal{BM}}(K,B) \le \frac{V(E_{out})}{V(E_{in})}.$$

□

Let K be a convex body with Santaló point at the origin. In [15], by using the affine isoperimetric inequality, Lutwak proved

$$V(K)V(K^*) \le \omega_n^2 \left(\frac{V(\Lambda K)}{V(K)}\right)^{n-1}. \tag{2.3}$$

We will use this inequality for $n = 2$ in the proof of the main theorem.

3. Proof of the main theorem

We shall begin by proving the claim for bodies in $\mathcal{K}_e^2$ that are of class $\mathcal{C}_+^\infty$. By John's ellipsoid theorem, we may assume without losing any generality, after applying a $GL(2)$ transformation, that

$$1 \le h_K \le \sqrt{2}. \tag{3.1}$$

In view of inequality (2.3), inequality $V(K)V(K^*) \ge \frac{\pi^2}{1+\varepsilon}$ gives

$$1 \ge \frac{V(\Lambda K)}{V(K)} \ge \frac{1}{1+\varepsilon}. \tag{3.2}$$

We will rewrite (3.2) as the following equivalent expression

$$\frac{V(K,\Lambda K)^2}{V(\Lambda K)V(K)} - 1 \le \varepsilon.$$

Therefore, by Groemer's stability theorem, (2.1), we obtain

$$\frac{V(K)}{4D^2(K)} \max_{u\in\mathbb{S}^1} \left| \frac{h_K(u)}{V(K)^{\frac{1}{2}}} - \frac{h_{\Lambda K}(u)}{V(\Lambda K)^{\frac{1}{2}}} \right|^2 \le \varepsilon.$$

Thus for every $u \in \mathbb{S}^1$ there holds

$$\frac{h_K^2(u)}{V(K)} \left| \frac{V(\Lambda K)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{V(K)^{\frac{1}{2}}} - \frac{h_{\Lambda K}(u)}{h_K(u)} \right|^2 \le \frac{h_K^2(u)}{V(\Lambda K)} \left| \frac{V(\Lambda K)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{V(K)^{\frac{1}{2}}} - \frac{h_{\Lambda K}(u)}{h_K(u)} \right|^2 \le \frac{32}{\pi}\varepsilon. \tag{3.3}$$

Using (3.1) we can estimate the left-hand side of (3.3) to obtain

$$\max_{u\in\mathbb{S}^1}\left|\frac{V(\Lambda K)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{V(K)^{\frac{1}{2}}}-\frac{h_{\Lambda K}(u)}{h_K(u)}\right|^2\leq 64\varepsilon. \tag{3.4}$$

Recall from (2.2) that

$$h_K=\left(\frac{V(K)}{V(K^*)}\right)^{\frac{1}{3}}\frac{1}{f_{\Lambda K}^{\frac{1}{3}}}.$$

Plugging this into (3.4) gives

$$\left(\frac{V(K^*)}{V(K)}\right)^{\frac{2}{3}}\max_{u\in\mathbb{S}^1}\left|\frac{V(\Lambda K)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{V(K)^{\frac{1}{2}}}\left(\frac{V(K)}{V(K^*)}\right)^{\frac{1}{3}}-(h_{\Lambda K}f_{\Lambda K}^{\frac{1}{3}})(u)\right|^2\leq 64\varepsilon.$$

On the other hand, as (3.1) also implies $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\leq h_{K^*}\leq 1$, we deduce that

$$\max_{u\in\mathbb{S}^1}\left|\frac{V(\Lambda K)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{V(K)^{\frac{1}{2}}}\left(\frac{V(K)}{V(K^*)}\right)^{\frac{1}{3}}-(h_{\Lambda K}f_{\Lambda K}^{\frac{1}{3}})(u)\right|^2\leq (64)4^{\frac{2}{3}}\varepsilon.$$

In particular, this last inequality leads us to

$$\max_{u\in\mathbb{S}^1}(h_{\Lambda K}f_{\Lambda K}^{\frac{1}{3}})(u)-\min_{u\in\mathbb{S}^1}(h_{\Lambda K}f_{\Lambda K}^{\frac{1}{3}})(u)\leq 2^{\frac{25}{6}}\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}. \tag{3.5}$$

By multiplying ΛK with $\sqrt{\frac{\pi}{V(\Lambda K)}}$ we have $V\left(\sqrt{\frac{\pi}{V(\Lambda K)}}\Lambda K\right)=\pi$. So by Remark 2, Corollary 4, and (3.5) we get

$$2^{\frac{25}{6}}\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(\frac{\pi}{V(\Lambda K)}\right)^{2/3}+1\geq\left(\frac{\pi}{V(\Lambda K)}\right)^{2/3}\max_{\mathbb{S}^1}(h_{\Lambda K}f_{\Lambda K}^{\frac{1}{3}}),$$

and

$$1-2^{\frac{25}{6}}\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(\frac{\pi}{V(\Lambda K)}\right)^{2/3}\leq\left(\frac{\pi}{V(\Lambda K)}\right)^{2/3}\min_{\mathbb{S}^1}(h_{\Lambda K}f_{\Lambda K}^{\frac{1}{3}}).$$

Furthermore, notice that by (3.1) and (3.2) the following inequality holds:

$$1-2^{\frac{25}{6}}\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(\frac{\pi}{V(\Lambda K)}\right)^{2/3}\geq 1-2^{\frac{25}{6}}\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}(1+\varepsilon)^{\frac{2}{3}}.$$

Take ε small enough such that

$$1-2^{\frac{25}{6}}\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}(1+\varepsilon)^{2/3}>0.$$

So far we have proved: If ε is small enough, then

$$\max_{\mathbb{S}^1}(h_{\Lambda K}f_{\Lambda K}^{\frac{1}{3}})\leq\left(1+2^{\frac{25}{6}}\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}(1+\varepsilon)^{2/3}\right)\left(\frac{\pi}{V(\Lambda K)}\right)^{-2/3},$$

and

$$\min_{\mathbb{S}^1}(h_{\Lambda K}f_{\Lambda K}^{\frac{1}{3}})\geq\left(1-2^{\frac{25}{6}}\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}(1+\varepsilon)^{2/3}\right)\left(\frac{\pi}{V(\Lambda K)}\right)^{-2/3}>0.$$

With the aid of these last inequalities and Corollary 4 we deduce that

$$d_{\mathcal{BM}}(\Lambda K,B)\leq\left(\frac{1+2^{\frac{25}{6}}\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}(1+\varepsilon)^{2/3}}{1-2^{\frac{25}{6}}\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}(1+\varepsilon)^{2/3}}\right)^{3/2}. \tag{3.6}$$

We return to inequality (3.4) and combine it with (3.2) to get

$$-8\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}+\frac{1}{(1+\varepsilon)^{\frac{1}{2}}}\leq -8\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}+\frac{V(\Lambda K)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{V(K)^{\frac{1}{2}}}\leq \frac{h_{\Lambda K}}{h_K}\leq 8\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}+\frac{V(\Lambda K)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{V(K)^{\frac{1}{2}}}\leq 1+8\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Furthermore, take ε small enough such that $-8\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}+\frac{1}{(1+\varepsilon)^{\frac{1}{2}}}>0$. Consequently

$$d_{\mathcal{BM}}(K,\Lambda K)\leq \frac{1+8\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}}{-8\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}+\frac{1}{(1+\varepsilon)^{\frac{1}{2}}}}. \tag{3.7}$$

Taking into account (3.6), (3.7), and the multiplicativity of the Banach-Mazur distance results in the desired estimate:

$$d_{\mathcal{BM}}(K,B)\leq \left(\frac{1+2^{\frac{25}{6}}\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}\,(1+\varepsilon)^{2/3}}{1-2^{\frac{25}{6}}\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}\,(1+\varepsilon)^{2/3}}\right)^{3/2}\left(\frac{1+8\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}}{-8\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}+\frac{1}{(1+\varepsilon)^{\frac{1}{2}}}}\right)\leq 1+\gamma\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

for some universal $\gamma>0$, provided that ε is small enough.

It follows from [22, Section 3.4] that the class of $\mathcal{C}_+^\infty$ origin-symmetric convex bodies is dense in $\mathcal{K}_e^n$. Therefore, an approximation argument will prove that the claim of the main theorem, in fact, holds for any origin-symmetric convex body. To get the more general result, for bodies in $\mathcal{K}^2$, we will first need to recall Theorem 1.4 of Böröczky from [6] and a theorem of Meyer and Pajor from [18]:

Theorem (Böröczky, [6]). *For any convex body K in $\mathbb{R}^n$ with $d_{\mathcal{BM}}(K,B)\geq 1+\varepsilon$ for $\varepsilon>0$, there exists an origin-symmetric convex body C and a constant $\gamma'>0$ depending on n such that $d_{\mathcal{BM}}(C,B)\geq 1+\gamma'\varepsilon^2$ and C results from K as a limit of subsequent Steiner symmetrizations and affine transformations.*

Theorem (Meyer, Pajor, [18]). *Let K be a convex body in $\mathbb{R}^n$, H be a hyperplane, and let K_H be the Steiner symmetral of K with respect to H. If s and s' denote the Santaló points of K and K_H, respectively, then $s'\in H$, and $V(K^s)\leq V((K_H)^{s'})$.*

Now we give the proof in the general case by contraposition. Let K be a convex body such that

$$d_{\mathcal{BM}}(K,B)>1+\left(\frac{\gamma}{\gamma'}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{4}},$$

where γ' is the constant in Böröczky's theorem. So by the last two theorems, there exists an origin-symmetric convex body C, such that $V(C)V(C^*)\geq V(K)V(K^s)$ and $d_{\mathcal{BM}}(C,B)>1+\gamma\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}$. Moreover, $d_{\mathcal{BM}}(C,B)>1+\gamma\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}$ implies that

$$V(C)V(C^*)<\frac{\pi^2}{1+\varepsilon}.$$

Therefore

$$V(K)V(K^s)<\frac{\pi^2}{1+\varepsilon}.$$

The argument is complete.

References

1. B. Andrews, *The affine curve-lengthening flow.* J. Reine Angew. Math. **506**, 43-83 (1999)
2. K. Ball, K.J. Böröczky, *Stability of some versions of the Prékopa-Leindler inequality.* Monatsh. Math. **163**, 1–14 (2011)
3. F. Barthe, K.J. Böröczky, M. Fradelizi, *Stability of the functional forms of the Blaschke-Santaló inequality.* Monatsh. Math. **173**, 135–159 (2014)
4. W. Blaschke, *Über affine Geometrie I: Isoperimetrische Eigenschaften von Ellipse und Ellipsoid.* Ber. Verh. Sächs. Akad. Leipzig, Math.-Phys. Kl. **68**, 217–39 (1916)
5. T. Bonnesen, W. Fenchel, *Theorie der konvexen Körper.* Springer-Verlag, Berlin, (1934)
6. K.J. Böröczky, *Stability of Blaschke-Santaló inequality and the affine isoperimetric inequality.* Adv. in Math. **225**, 1914–1928 (2010)
7. K.J. Böröczky, E. Makai, Jr. *On the volume product of planar polar convex bodies-upper estimates: the polygonal case and stability.* in preparation.
8. S.Y. Cheng, S.T. Yau, *On the Regularity of the Solution of the n-dimensional Minkowski Problem.* Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **29**, 495–516 (1976)
9. D. Ghilli, P. Salani, *Stability of isoperimetric type inequalities for some Monge-Ampère functionals.* Ann. Mat. Pura Appl. **193**(3), 643–661 (2014)
10. H. Groemer, *Stability Properties of Geometric Inequalities.* Amer. Math. Monthly **97**(5) 382–394 (1990)
11. M.N. Ivaki, *Centro-affine curvature flows on centrally symmetric convex curves.* Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., to appear, arXiv:1205.6456v2.
12. M.N. Ivaki, *On the stability of the p-affine isoperimetric inequality.* J. Geom. Anal. DOI: 10.1007/s12220-013-9401-1
13. M. Ludwig, M. Reitzner, *A classification of $SL(n)$ invariant valuations.* Ann. of Math. **172**, 1219–1267 (2010)
14. M. Ludwig, *General affine surface areas.* Adv. in Math. **353**, 1767–1779 (2010)
15. E. Lutwak, *On some affine isoperimetric inequalities.* J. Differential Geom. **23**, 1–13 (1986)
16. E. Lutwak, *Centroid bodies and dual mixed volumes.* Proc. London. Math. Soc. **60**, 365–391 (1990)
17. E. Lutwak, *The Brunn-Minkowski-Firey theory. II: Affine and geominimal surface areas.* Adv. in Math. **118** 244–294 (1996)
18. M. Meyer, A. Pajor, *On the Blaschke-Santaló inequality.* Arch. Math. (Basel) **55** 82–93 (1990)
19. C.M. Petty, *Affine isoperimetric problems.* Ann. N.Y. Acad. Sci. **440**, 113–127 (1985)
20. J. Saint-Raymond, *Sur le volume des corps convexes symétriques.* Séminaire Choquet-Initiation á l'Analyse 1980-81 Exp. No. 11, pp. 1–25. Université Pierre et Marie Curie, Paris, (1981)
21. L.A. Santaló, *An affine invariant for convex bodies of n-dimensional space.* Portugalia Math. **8**, 155–161 (1949)
22. R. Schneider, *Convex bodies: The Brunn-Minkowski theory, Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications.* Cambridge University Press, New York, (2014)

Institut für Diskrete Mathematik und Geometrie, Technische Universität Wien, Wiedner Hauptstr. 8–10, 1040 Wien, Austria

E-mail address: mohammad.ivaki@tuwien.ac.at